

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are pending. Claims 3, 9, 12, and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, and 20 are currently amended. The Examiner has objected to the drawings and claims 3 and 20. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito (Japanese Application 03-300482) in view of Fairbanks et al. (U.S. Patent 5307003). The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 11-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Fairbanks and further in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0255174). The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Fairbanks and Chen, and further in view of Wittlinger (U.S. Publication 2004/0178940). The Examiner has rejected claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Levin et al. (U.S. Patent 5841313). The Examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito and Levin and further in view of Wittlinger. The Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito and Levin and further in view of Chen.

1. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants have amended Figure 3 to include “the power draw of the computer system is reduced” in order to show the feature that the “power draw of the computer system is reduced to a level below the rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of the array.” Additionally, Applicants believe the element “the signal at the processor is asserted by the BIOS of the computer system” is illustrated in Figure 2, which shows that the BIOS is communicatively coupled to the processor(s) of the system. The amended specification clarifies that the BIOS asserts this signal via the connections illustrated in Figure 2. Finally,

Applicants have cancelled claims 3, 9, 12, and 22, which described turning a clock of the processor on and off. Applicants believe that the drawings now show every feature of the invention specified in the pending claims and respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

2. Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 20 due to informalities. Applicants have cancelled claim 3 and have amended claim 20 as requested by the Examiner. Applicants request that the objections to the pending claims be withdrawn.

3. Independent Claims 1 and 7

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been rejected by the Examiner as being obvious over Saito and Fairbanks. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The combination of Saito and Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest the required element of independent claims 1 and 7 "wherein the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of the array is less than the total rated capacity of the fully operational array." The Specification differentiates between the rated capacity of the remaining functioning power supply from that of the full power array. (Spec., p.8:5-10)

Saito fails to teach or suggest "wherein the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of the array is less than the total rated capacity of the fully operational array." In

fact, Saito teaches that the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies is **the same** as the total rated capacity of the array when it is fully operational. Saito discusses having 3 power supplies individually rated to provide 50A but setting a rated capacity to only 100A (instead of the maximum possible 150A), such that when one of the 3 fails, the rated capacity of 100A is still met. (Saito, [0012]). Thus, Saito teaches that the rated capacity of the full array and the diminished array (when one of the power supply units fails) is the same. This is in direct contrast to the present invention, in which the rated capacity of the functional remainder of an array is less than the full capacity, thus necessitating the reduction of processor power consumption. Additionally, Fairbanks fails to remedy this deficiency. There is no mention of the capacity or rating of a power supply unit, and specifically, Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of an array being less than the total rated capacity of the array when it is fully operational. Thus, the combination of Saito and Fairbanks fails to teach or suggest this required element of independent claims 1 and 7, and therefore, the combination fails to render these claims obvious. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

4. Independent Claim 20

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been rejected by the Examiner as being obvious over Saito and Levin. However, the combination of Saito and Levin fails to teach or suggest the required element of claim 20, “wherein the total rated capacity of the functioning power supplies of the array is less than the total rated capacity of the fully operational array.”

Saito fails to teach or suggest this claimed element for the reasons stated above with respect to independent claims 1 and 7. Additionally, Levin does not discuss power supply ratings or capacities at all, and thus fails to teach or suggest the total rated capacity of the

functioning power supplies of an array being less than the total rated capacity of the array when it is fully operational. Thus, the combination of Saito and Levin fails to teach or suggest this required element of independent claim 20, and therefore, the combination fails to render this claim obvious. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

5. Dependent Claims

The pending dependent claims will not be discussed individually herein, as they depend from otherwise allowable base claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger Fulghum
Registration No. 39,678

Baker Botts L.L.P.
910 Louisiana St.
One Shell Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
(713) 229-1707

Baker Botts Docket Number: 016295.1560

Date: April 6, 2007